IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO.663 of 2005

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 11/03/2005 in W.P.No.853 of 2005 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

1. Dasaraju Narayana,

S/o Munnaiah, Hindu,

R/o Kasavarigudem, Garidepalli (M)

Nalgonda district.

2. Dasaraju Mangaiah, S/o Ramaiah,

R/o Kasavarigudem, Garidepalli (M)

Nalgonda district.

3. Dasaraju Lakshmaiah, S/o Ramaiah,

R/o Kasavarigudem, Garidepalli (M)

Nalgonda district.

..... APPELLANTS/RESPONDENTS,2,3 & 4

AND

1. Sangu Brahmam,

S/o Late lakshminarayana,
R/o Huzurnagar Village and Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

2. Sangu Srinivasa Rao,

S/o Late lakshminarayana,
R/o Huzurnagar Village and Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

3. Sangu Naga Malleswara Rao,

S/o Late lakshminarayana,
R/o Huzurnagar Village and Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

4. Sangu Janakamma,

W/o Late lakshminarayana,
R/o Huzurnagar Village and Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

5. Mamidi Govindamma, W/o Jayaram,

R/o Huzurnagar Village and Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

6. Sangepu Jayalakshmi, W/o Subba Rao,

R/o Ketheveerampadu,

Nandigam Mandal, Nalgonda district.

7. Vaddepalli Savitri, W/o Prasad,

R/o Nagulavancha, Chintakani mandal,

Nalgonda district.

8. Putta Eshwaramma, W/o Nageswara Rao,

Jangoan, Warangal district.

9. The State House officer, Garidepalli P.S.,

Nalgonda district.

10. Dasaraju Pichaiah, S/o Ramaiah,

R/o Kasavarigudem, Garidepalli Mandal,

Nalgonda district.

.....RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS

Counsel for the Appellants : Mrs. S.Nanda

Counsel for the Respondents : Govt. Pleader for Home

Sri M.Rajamalla Reddy

The Court made the following :

W.A.No.663 of 2005

HCJ & BSSR,J

ORAL JUDGMENT: (Per Hon'ble the Chief Justice)

Learned single Judge in the order impugned in this appeal concluded that as per the findings recorded by the competent Civil Court, writ petitioners were in possession and proceeded to issue direction to the first respondent in the writ petition to extend necessary help in order to protect their possession unless they are dispossessed through any proceedings in accordance with law by an appropriate court or statutory authority.

Learned counsel for appellants would state that the appellants are in possession. Needless to add that the learned single Judge did consider the aspect that appellants are also claiming to be in possession and appellants had lost the civil suit and had failed even at the appellate stage. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere with such an order. Appellants herein have to work out remedies in accordance with law in case they want to get rid off the contesting respondents from the land in question.

The writ appeal is dismissed.

_____

DEVINDER GUPTA, C.J.

_____

B.SESHASAYANA REDDY, J

31-03-2005

bsc

To

1. The State House officer, Garidepalli P.S.,

Nalgonda district.

2. 2 CCs to Govt. Pleader for Home, High Court buildings,

Hyderabad (OUT)

3. 2 CD copies